# Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

			RECEIVED
Before th FEDERAL COMMUNICATI Washington, D.C	ie		MADIA
Washington, D.C	ONS C C. 2055	54	COMMUNICA-
			THICE OF SECRETARY
In the Matter of	)		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Revision of the Commission's Rules To Ensure Compatibility With Enhanced	) ) )	CC Docket N RM-8143	Io. 94-102
911 Emergency Calling Systems	)	DOCKET FILE	COPY ORIGINAL

#### REPLY COMMENTS OF AMERITECH

#### I. Introduction

Ameritech respectfully submits these Reply Comments in the abovecaptioned matter, and generally voices its support for the "Wireless Industry Consensus" document (hereinafter "IC document") and the process from which that document issued. However, since that document represents the views of only a segment of the wireless telecommunications industry rather than a true, industry-wide consensus, the Commission should be circumspect about adopting it as a statement of full agreement of all parties as to all issues. Specifically, since the IC document specifies some timeframes that are simply not feasible with existing technology, and since consensus has not been reached on several policy issues raised therein, the Commission should not adopt the document in its entirety.

The of Charles recia C

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "Public Safety-Wireless Industry Consensus: Wireless Compatibility Issues," CC Docket No., 94-102, Public Notice, DA 96-108, rel. February 16, 1996.

## II. The timeframes in the I/C Document may not be realistic.

As noted by PCIA, the IC document is nothing more or less than "the product of negotiations between representatives of the public safety community and a trade association representing the cellular telephone industry." Thus, a number of technical issues remain to be worked out and coordinated among the various entities involved. For example, the document's proposed requirement that wireless providers present E911 systems, within 18 months, with full cell site information (using both a 7- or 10-digit "pseudo-ANI" and a 7- or 10-digit caller ANI) is not likely to be met given the fact that most existing CMRS providers networks are currently incapable of carrying both types of information simultaneously.<sup>3</sup> These and other technical considerations on which debate is still open militate against mandating a specific deployment date for those items listed in the "Phase I" timetable as proposed in the document. A more realistic approach is suggested by those who urged the Commission to base its deployment requirements upon ongoing industry efforts and good-faith negotiations among all the parties involved.<sup>4</sup> Ameritech urges reliance upon good faith

<sup>2</sup> Comments of PCIA, at 9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> <u>See, e.g.</u>, the suggestion that "Phase I deployment should "be based entirely on good faith negotiations between public safety organizations, wireless carriers, and landline carriers" (Comments of U S West, at 4), and the proposal that deployment be undertaken "with the cooperation of PSAPs in the area" (Comments of SBMS, at 2-4). Ongoing efforts include the current TIA standards process which treats many such issues in a true consensus process.

negotiation among the parties instead of adopting an arbitrary implementation deadline agreed upon by only a few of the parties.

## III. Any E911 surcharge adopted must be technology- and carrier-neutral.

Several parties noted that a cost-recovery method has yet to be established for the substantial costs to be incurred by virtue of E911 deployment.<sup>5</sup> Until the significant issues associated with cost recovery are formalized and reduced to a fair means of apportionment among the many entities who stand to both incur and benefit from those costs, no industry-wide surcharge should be mandated by the Commission. Moreover, to avoid favoring any single technology or class of provider in the allocation of such costs, any further efforts to develop a so-called "surcharge" should be based on a policy of neutrality; e.g., in no event should the fees paid by the customers of wireless carriers exceed those paid by customers of wireline service providers. Absent such a "level playing field," E911 deployment could unfairly advantage a particular type of service or class of service provider.

#### IV. Liability issues remain to be resolved.

As noted by several parties, the question of carrier liability for uncompleted or ineffective E911 connections is still to be resolved.<sup>6</sup> Dropped calls, lack of channels, ANI transmission errors, and a number of other

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Comments of SBMS, at 6; Comments of U S West, at 5; Comments of PCIA, at 8-9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See, e.g., Comments of SBMS (at 7-9); Comments of PCIA (at 7-8).

4

potential problems which could impact the reliability and accuracy of the E911

data transmitted to PSAPs are arguably beyond the scope of this proceeding.

Thus, carrier liability for problems such as these must be limited or shared in

some rational manner. The Commission's approach to these issues remains

crucial to the deployment of wireless E911 capabilities, and should be finalized

as soon as practical to avoid delays in the availability of these important

services to the public.

V. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, the Commission should refrain from

adopting the IC document as written, and recognize that ongoing industry

efforts offer the best means of issuing the successful, timely deployment of

advanced E911 capability to the public.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank Michael Panek

Counsel for Ameritech

Room 4H84

2000 West Ameritech Center Drive

Trank My forekjm

Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

(847) 248-6064

Dated: March 11, 1996

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Deborah L. Simmons do hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing REPLY COMMENTS OF AMERITECH has been served on the parties listed on the attached service list, via first class mail, postage prepaid, on this 11th day of March 1996.

By: Deborah J. Simmons/yrec

Deborah L. Simmons

Bruce D. Jacobs
Glenn S. Richards
Stephen J. Berman
Attorneys for AMSC Subsidiary Corporation
Fisher Wayland Cooper
Leader & Zaragoza L.L.P.
2001 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006

Lon C. Levin Vice President and Regulatory Counsel AMSC Subsidiary Corporation 10802 Park Ridge Boulevard Reston, Virginia 22091

Michael R. Bennet Caressa D. Bennet Attorneys for Ad Hoc Rural Cellular Coalition Bennet & Bennet, PLLC 1831 Ontario Place, N.W. Suite 200 Washington, DC 20009 Alan R. Shark, President American Mobile Telecommunications Association, Inc. 1150 18th Street, N.W., Suite 250 Washington, DC 20036

Samuel A. Simon Counsel for Ad Hoc Alliance for Public Access to 911 901 15th Street, N.W., Suite 230 Washington, DC 20005

John Prendergast Susan J. Bahr Blooston, Mordkofsky, Jackson & Dickens 2120 L Street, N.W. Suite 300 Washington, DC 20554

John F. Beasley William B. Barfield Jim O Llewellyn Attorneys for BellSouth Corporation 1155 Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, GA 30309-3610

Charles P. Featherstun David G. Richards Attorneys for BellSouth Corporation 1133 21st St., N.W., Suite 900 Washington, DC 20036

Alejandro A. Calderon President Concepts to Operations, Inc. (CTO) 801 Campass Way, Suite 217 Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Andre J. Lachance GTE Service Corporation GTE Mobilnet Incorporated 1850 M Street, N.W. Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20036 Radm Rudy K. Peschel, Chairman Interagency Committee on Search and Rescue United States Coast Guard 2100 Second St., S.W. Washington, DC 20593-0001 Charles J. Hinkle, Jr. KSI, Inc. 7630 Little River Turnpike Suite 212 Annadale, Virginia 22003

Mary E. Brooner Manager, Wireless Regulatory Policies Motorola, Inc. 1350 I Street, N.W., Suite 400 Washington, DC 20005 Lawrence R. Krevor Director - Government Affairs Nextel Communications, Inc. 800 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 1001 Washington, DC 20006

Stephen L. Goodman Counsel for Northern Telecom, Inc. Halprin, Temple, Goodman & Sugrue 1100 New York Avenue, N.W. Suite 650, East Tower Washington, DC 20005 R. Michael Senkowski
Jeffrey S. Linder
Stephen J. Rosen
Attorneys for Personal Communications
Industry Association
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Mark J. Golden
Vice President of Industry Affairs
Personal Communications Industry
Association
500 Montgomery Street
Suite 700
Alexandria, VA 22314-1561

Richard D. Adams, President Rural Cellular Association 2120 L Street, N.W. Suite 520 Washington, DC 20037

Glen A. Glass, Vice President, General Counsel & Secretary
Carol L. Tacker, General Attorney
Bruce E. Beard, Attorney
Southwestern Bell Mobile Systems, Inc.
17330 Preston Road, Suite 100A
Dallas, TX 75252

Jeffrey S. Bork Attorney for U S West, Inc. 1020 19th Street, N.W., Suite 700 Washington, DC 20036 Raymond G. Bender, Jr.
J.G. Harrington
Attorneys for
Vanguard Cellular Systems, Inc.
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson
1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20037